```
1
 2
                                                                 \bigcirc
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 8
                 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 9
                           WESTERN DIVISION
10
11
12
   RAY RONNIE GOVEA,
                                     No. CV 11-03396-CAS (VBK)
                   Petitioner,
                                      ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND
13
                                       RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED STATES
14
         v.
                                       MAGISTRATE JUDGE
   ROBERT TRIMBLE,
15
16
                   Respondent.
17
         Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Third
18
19
    Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Third Amended Petition"),
    the records and files herein, and the Report and Recommendation of the
20
   United States Magistrate Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has
21
    engaged in <u>de</u> <u>novo</u> review of those portions of the Report to which
22
   Petitioner has objected.
23
24
   //
25
   //
    //
26
    //
27
28
```

1

27

28

issuance of a COA.

IT IS ORDERED that: (1) the Court accepts the findings and 2 recommendations of the Magistrate Judge, and (2) the Court declines to issue a Certificate of Appealability ("COA").1 3 Christine a. Smyde 4 5 DATED: November 4, 2014 CHRISTINA A. SNYDER 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Under 28 U.S.C. §2253(c)(2), a COA may issue "only if the 21 applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." The Supreme Court has held that, to obtain a 22 Certificate of Appealability under §2253(c), a habeas petitioner must 23 show that "reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a 24 different manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further'." Slack v. McDaniel, 529 25 U.S. 473, 483-84, 120 S.Ct. 1595 (2000)(internal quotation marks omitted); see also Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336, 123 S.Ct. 26

1029 (2003). After review of Petitioner's contentions herein, this Court concludes that Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of

the denial of a constitutional right, as is required to support the